

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/537,732	06/07/2005	Steven W Sutton	JJPR-0177	6621
23377 WOODCOCK	7590 10/09/2007 WASHBURN LLP		EXAMINER	
CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR			WEGERT, SANDRA L	
2929 ARCH S	TREET IIA, PA 19104-2891		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	, 171 1710 / 2071		1647	
		·	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/09/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary		10/537,732	SUTTON ET AL.					
		Examiner	Art Unit					
		Sandra Wegert	1647					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
A SHORTENED STATU WHICHEVER IS LONGE - Extensions of time may be availa after SIX (6) MONTHS from the - If NO period for reply is specified - Failure to reply within the set or	R, FROM THE MAILING DA sible under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 mailing date of this communication. I above, the maximum statutory period vextended period for reply will, by statute later than three months after the mailing	IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTHATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (Seta). In no event, however, may a reply be to will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from Cause the application to become ABANDON date of this communication, even if timely file	DN.  timely filed  m the mailing date of this communication.  JED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
<u></u>								
2a) This action is <b>FIN</b>	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 May 2007</u> .  This action is <b>FINAL</b> .  2b) This action is non-final.							
/ <del></del>	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposition of Claims								
4a) Of the above cl 5) Claim(s) is/s 6) Claim(s) is/s 7) Claim(s) is/s	are rejected.	vn from consideration.						
Application Papers								
<ul> <li>9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.</li> <li>10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).</li> <li>11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.</li> </ul>								
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	119							
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>								
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (		4) Interview Summa						
Notice of Draftsperson's Pate     Information Disclosure State     Paper No(s)/Mail Date	ent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ment(s) (PTO/SB/08) .·	Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Date I Patent Application					

## Election/Restrictions

### Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

- I. Claims 1-17, drawn to a method of identifying compounds that modulate Orexin activity, kits used for the claimed method, and compounds produced by the method.
- II. Claims 18-21, drawn to a method of treating a patient using an orexin agonist or antagonist.

#### **Species Election**

Furthermore, if applicant elects Invention II (above) applicant is further required to elect *one* disorder from those listed in Claims 19 and 21.

The Inventions listed as Inventions I and II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

Art Unit: 1647

Lack of unity is shown because the methods of identifying ligands for Orexin are functionally different from methods of treating patients, because these methods lack a common utility which is based upon a common structural feature which has been identified as the basis for that common utility.

Furthermore, the species (disorders) listed in the claims do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Each is a well-defined disease with different underlying etiologies and different methods used in their treatment.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species from each of the types of pathological disorders to which claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

In response to this Office Action/Election requirement, applicants must elect from Groups I-II and must elect a disorder if Group I is chosen. Applicant is advised that in order for the reply to this requirement to be complete it must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 C.F.R. 1.143).

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP §

Art Unit: 1647

809.02(a).

#### Rejoinder under Ochiai/Brouwer

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04.

Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the

Application/Control Number: 10/537,732 Page 5

Art Unit: 1647

may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

#### Limit on claim number

Applicant is advised that the final rules on claims and continuations were published in the Federal Register Tuesday, August 21, 2007. As of November 1, 2007, the claims in each application may not exceed 5 independent claims or 25 total claims absent the applicant assisting the examination process through the filing of an Examination Support Document (ESD). The following is taken from the published rules package:

- Applicants may present, without an ESD, up to:
  - o Five (5) independent claims or
  - Twenty-five (25) total claims in an application.
- Applicant may present more than 5/25 claims, if applicant files an ESD before the first Office action on the merits (FAOM).
- The 5/25 claim threshold does not count withdrawn claims.
  - Applicant may provide a suggested restriction requirement (SRR) before first Office action or a restriction requirement.

Application/Control Number: 10/537,732

Art Unit: 1647

• The 5/25 claim threshold does count all of the claims present in other copending

application(s) having a patentably indistinct claim, but not the claims in issued

Page 6

patents.

o Applicant may present up to 15/75 claims via an initial application and 2

continuation or CIP applications prosecuted serially.

The final rules will become effective November 1, 2007, and will apply to all pending

applications as of that date. Applicants are advised to ensure that the elected claims are

compliant with the new rules to avoid delay of prosecution. There will be no change to the

examiner practice prior to the date the rules become effective. Information on the new rules will

be available at:

http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/opla/presentation/clmcontfinalrule.html

If Applicant has any questions concerning the new rules, email patentpractice@uspto.gov or call

571-272-7704.

**Advisory information** 

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Sandra Wegert whose telephone number is (571) 272-0895. The

examiner can normally be reached Monday - Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM (Eastern Time).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor,

Manjunath Rao, can be reached at (571) 272-0939.

Application/Control Number: 10/537,732 Page 7

Art Unit: 1647

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (in USA or CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SLW

30 September 2007

ilan B. O Hay